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Please note that this report is based on preliminary analyses and data should not be distributed in formal reports.
Methodology summary

Data: Possible positive shifts
- Views of vaccinators
- Vaccinator gender profile
- Rumors
- Institutional framing
- Perceptions of community/neighbor norms & support

Data: Momentum & possible province pushback
- Self-reported coverage
- Motivation for taking OPV
- Intent to vaccinate in future

Data: New Insights & challenges
- Frequency of visits
- Inconsistencies in norms and support

Reactions & Next steps
Methodology Summary
Respondents: Adult caregivers of children <5 years old

Timing of interviews: 12 March to 14 May 2017

Interviews:
• In-person interviews using paper and pen
• Local, specially-trained interviewers and supervisors
• Firm-based and independent quality control

Questionnaire:
• Foundation of the collaborative instrument agreed upon globally
• Customized within Pakistan and for third poll
Analytic Goals & Sample Design

- **Goals:**
  - To be representative of select Tier 1 and Tier 2 districts
  - To facilitate comparisons between 2017 and 2016

- **Design:**
  - Mirrors districts 2016 poll with addition of Lakki Marwat and select Karachi UCs
  - Oversample of identifiable “high-risk” UCs from 2016 poll where needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Sample in UCs from 2016</th>
<th>Sample in UCs new to 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>Killa Abdulah</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pishin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>FR Bannu</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khyber</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
<td>Bannu</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakki Marwat</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>Karachi Baldia</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karachi Gadap</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karachi (select UCs)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4800</strong></td>
<td><strong>3229</strong></td>
<td><strong>1571</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighting & Analysis

Weighting:
• Data were weighted to account for:
  o Analytic design (using target population estimates from IDIMS)
    o District (i.e., set sample sizes)
    o UCs from 2016 survey (i.e., oversampled 2016 UCs)
  o Possible non-response
    o Age and sex of caregivers from roster
    o Sex ratio of children <5 years from DHS 2012-13
  o Selection within household
    o Number of caregivers in household from roster

Analyses:
• Analyses presented here are preliminary; additional analyses are ongoing
• Analyses comparing waves should be interpreted with caution
  • Not true evaluation study – no tracking of interventions or external changes
  • Differences in demographics between waves may exist
  • Sample sizes do not permit wave comparisons at the district level
  • Broad wave comparisons may vary slightly from comparisons of overlapping UCs
• No final statistical tests of differences are presented in this report; future comparative analyses will focus on targeted differences of at least 10 percentage points

Please note: Numbers may not add to total or 100% due to rounding. The following are not necessarily shown when <5%: those not asked the question; refusals; responses of “don’t know”, “not applicable,” or “none of the above.” Numbers in this presentation may be refined through further analyses. Detailed methodology under separate cover.
Possible Positive Shifts

- Views of vaccinators
- Vaccinator gender profile
- Rumors
- Perception of community norms & support
- Institutional framing
Caregiver Assessment of Vaccinators Compared to Those in Past

% caregivers saying, compared to other vaccinators who have visited home in past, these vaccinators were... (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=3273
Caregiver Assessment of Vaccinators Compared to Those in Past

% caregivers saying, compared to other vaccinators who have visited home in past, these vaccinators were better (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Caregivers Saying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>74% (n=3273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>81% (n=764)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>54% (n=533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>79% (n=872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>65% (n=1104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caregiver Assessment of Vaccinators Compared to Those in Past

% caregivers saying, compared to other vaccinators who have visited home in past, these vaccinators were better (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

- **All high-risk UCs**: 74% (n=3273)
- **Balochistan UCs**: 81% (n=764)
  - **Khyber**: 39%
  - **FR Bannu**: 83%
- **FATA UCs**: 54% (n=533)
  - **Khyber**: 39%
  - **FR Bannu**: 83%
- **KP UCs**: 79% (n=872)
  - **Tank**: 53%
  - **Others**: 73-89%
- **Sindh UCs**: 65% (n=1104)
  - **K Gadap**: 55%
  - **Others**: 71-78%

FATA: Khyber n=166; FR Bannu n=367; KP: Tank n=323; Bannu n=277; Lakki Marwat n=102; Peshawar n=170; Sindh: K Gadap n=381; K Baldia n=327; K Other n=396
Caregiver Views of Vaccinators

% caregivers saying…
(among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

- They trusted vaccinators “a great deal”
  - 73%

- Vaccinators cared “a great deal”
  - 70%

- Vaccinators were “very knowledgeable” about children’s health
  - 70%

- Visit from vaccinators was “very pleasant”
  - 68%

Context Note - 2016:

- 68%
- 67%
- 52%
- 65%

n=3273
Caregiver Trust in Vaccinators

% caregivers saying they trusted vaccinators a great deal (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

- All high-risk UCs: 73%
- Balochistan UCs: 80%
- FATA UCs: 66%
- KP UCs: 82%
- Sindh UCs: 58%

Context Note - 2016:
- 68%
- 56%
- 69%
- 86%
- 44%

Total n=3273; Balochistan UCs n=764; FATA UCs=533; KP UCs =872; Sindh UCs=1104
Caregiver Trust in Vaccinators

% caregivers saying they trusted vaccinators a great deal
(among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

- All high-risk UCs: 73%
- Balochistan UCs: 80%
- FATA UCs: 66%
- KP UCs: 82%
- Sindh UCs: 58%

FATA: Khyber n=166; FR Bannu n=367; KP: Tank n=323; Bannu n=277; Lakki Marwat n=102; Peshawar n=170; Sindh: K Gadap n=381; K Baldia n=327; K Other n=396
Total n=3273; Balochistan UCs n=764; FATA UCs=533; KP UCs =872; Sindh UCs=1104
Caregiver Perceptions of Vaccinator Compassion

% caregivers saying vaccinators cared a great deal (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

- All high-risk UCs: 70%
- Balochistan UCs: 73%
- FATA UCs: 62%
- KP UCs: 77%
- Sindh UCs: 58%

Context Note - 2016:

- 67%
- 78%
- 72%
- 81%
- 29%

Total n=3273; Balochistan UCs n=764; FATA UCs=533; KP UCs =872; Sindh UCs=1104
Caregiver Perceptions of Vaccinator Knowledge

Q51

% caregivers saying vaccinators were very knowledgeable (among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

All high-risk UCs: 70%
Balochistan UCs: 69%
FATA UCs: 51%
KP UCs: 85%
Sindh UCs: 58%

Context Note - 2016:
52%
67%
42%
65%
21%

Total n=3273; Balochistan UCs n=764; FATA UCs=533; KP UCs =872; Sindh UCs=1104
Caregiver Perceptions of Visit Pleasantness

% caregivers saying visit from polio vaccinators was very pleasant
(among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context Note - 2016:

- Balochistan: Pishin n=248, K Abdulah n=216; Quetta n=300; FATA: Khyber n=166; FR Bannu n=367; KP: Tank n=323; Bannu n=277; Lakki Marwat n=102; Peshawar n=170; Sindh: K Gadap n=381; K Baldia n=327; K Other n=396
- Total n=3273; Balochistan UCs n=764; FATA UCs=533; KP UCs =872; Sindh UCs=1104
Caregiver Reports of Visits from ‘Unique’ Vaccinators

% caregivers saying, in past six months…

Yes, ‘unique’ vaccinator from neighborhood has come

75%

No, ‘unique’ vaccinator from neighborhood has not come

17%

Don’t know

7%

*Exact description:* “Among the polio vaccinators who have come to your home in the past 6 months, there may or may not have been one who is unique. She or he would live in your village/muhallah/neighborhood, and she or he would have come to your home every visit, while other polio vaccinators would vary.”

n=4800
Caregiver Views of ‘Unique’ Vaccinators

Q56 – Q58

% caregivers saying...
(among those saying ‘unique’ vaccinator from neighborhood has come in past six months)

They trusted ‘unique’ vaccinator “a great deal”
55%

‘Unique’ vaccinator cared “a great deal”
77%

‘Unique’ vaccinator was “very knowledgeable”
65%

Context Note – Views of Vaccinators:
• Trusted “a great deal” = 74%
• Vaccinators cared “a great deal” = 70%
• Vaccinators were “very knowledgeable” = 69%

Exact description: “Among the polio vaccinators who have come to your home in the past 6 months, there may or may not have been one who is unique. She or he would live in your village/muhallah/neighborhood, and she or he would have come to your home every visit, while other polio vaccinators would vary.”

n=3587
Caregiver Reports of Vaccinator Preferences and Vaccinator Gender and Age

Q65 and Q47

% caregivers saying, among vaccinators who come to their home, they would prefer to have...

A woman included

82%

Only men

11%

% caregivers saying vaccinators included...

(among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

A woman

89%

Only men

11%

Context Note – 2016:
• Included a woman: 79%
## Caregiver Reports of Vaccinator Gender

% caregivers saying vaccinators included a woman  
(among those saying they saw vaccinators during last campaign)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Caregivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All high-risk UCs | 89%  
| (n=3273)      |             |
| Balochistan UCs | 92%  
| (n=764)       |             |
| FATA UCs      | 37%         
| (n=533)       |             |
| KP UCs        | 90%         
| (n=872)       |             |
| Sindh UCs     | 100%        
| (n=1104)      |             |
Caregiver Knowledge of Institutions Organizing Polio Drop Efforts

% caregivers saying institution responsible for vaccinators in neighborhood is...

- Local health organization: 85%
- National government: 44%
- Local government / traditional leader: 41%
- Province/FATA government: 37%
- International organizations, such as United Nations or World Health Organization: 22%
- Governments of other countries: 7%
- Don’t know: 1%

Context Note – 2016:
- Local health organization was 67%
- National government was 39%
- Local government/traditional leader was 27%
- Province/FATA government was 29%
- International organizations was 20%
- Gov’ts of other countries was 5%

n=4800
### Caregiver Trust in Institutions Organizing Polio Drop Efforts

**Q66 and Q67**

**% caregivers saying they trust institution…**

*(among those who mention it as being responsible for vaccinators in neighborhood)*

- A great deal
- Somewhat
- Not very much
- Not at all
- Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local government/traditional leader</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local health organization</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/FATA government</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations, such as United Nations or WHO</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments of other countries</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- n=2380
- n=3969
- n=2387
- n=2082
- n=1410
- n=624
Caregiver Awareness of and Belief in ‘Destructive Rumors’ about Polio Drops

% caregivers saying they...

HEARD at least one destructive rumor
44%

BELIEVE at least one destructive rumor is at all true*
19%

BELIEVE at least one destructive rumor is true**
8%

**Mostly/completely true or mostly false

**Mostly/completely true

Destructive rumors include:
Polio drops…
- Can make boys unable to father children later in life
- Can make girls unable to have children later in life
- Are very likely to give a child polio
- Can give a child HIV/AIDS
- Are not halal
- Are made with urine or blood

Context Note – 2016:
- Heard any: 59%
- Believe any ‘at all true’: 23%
- Believe any ‘true’: 9%

n=4800
Caregiver Awareness of ‘Destructive Rumors’ about Polio Drops

% caregivers saying they HEARD at least one destructive rumor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% Awareness</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>n=4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>n=800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>n=1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destructive rumors include: Polio drops… Can make boys unable to father children later in life; Can make girls unable to have children later in life; Are very likely to give a child polio; Can give a child HIV/AIDS; Are not halal; Are made with urine or blood.
Caregiver Awareness of ‘Destructive Rumors’ about Polio Drops

% caregivers saying they HEARD at least one destructive rumor

- All high-risk UCs: 44% (n=4800)
  - Balochistan UCs: 61% (n=1200)
  - FATA UCs: 69% (n=800)
  - KP UCs: 32% (n=1600)
  - Sindh UCs: 33% (n=1200)

Destructive rumors include:
- Polio drops… Can make boys unable to father children later in life; Can make girls unable to have children later in life; Are very likely to give a child polio; Can give a child HIV/AIDS; Are not halal; Are made with urine or blood

Balochistan: Pishin n=400, K Abdulah n=400; Quetta n=400; FATA: Khyber n=400; FR Bannu n=400; KP: Tank n=400; Bannu n=400; Lakki Marwat n=400; Peshawar n=400
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rumor</th>
<th>2017 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops can make boys unable to father children later in life</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops can make girls unable to have children later in life</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops are not halal</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops are very likely to give a child polio</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops can give a child HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio drops are made with urine or blood</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caregiver Perceptions of Neighbors Giving Children Polio Drops Every Time

% caregivers saying fraction of neighbors who give their children polio drops every time is...

- All of their neighbors: 90%
- Not all of their neighbors: 9%
- Most of their neighbors: 6%
- Not very many of their neighbors: 2%
- None of their neighbors: 0%
- Don’t know: 1%

Context Note – 2016:
- “Not all neighbors” was 34%

n=4800
### Caregiver Perceptions of Neighbors Giving Children Polio Drops Every Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>n=4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>n=800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>n=1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes responses of “Most of your neighbors”, “Not very many of your neighbors”, “None of your neighbors”
Caregiver Reports of Neighbors’ Opposition to Polio Drops

Q63

% caregivers saying any neighbors are against polio drops

- Yes, some neighbors are against polio drops: 21%
- No, none are against polio drops: 73%
- Don’t know: 4%

Context Note – 2016:
- “Some neighbors against” was 31%

n=4800
% caregivers saying some neighbors are against polio drops

- All high-risk UCs: 21% (n=4800)
- Balochistan UCs: 26% (n=1200)
- FATA UCs: 22% (n=800)
- KP UCs: 18% (n=1600)
- Sindh UCs: 17% (n=1200)
Caregiver Perceptions of How Many Neighbors Are Opposed to Polio Drops

% caregivers saying fraction of neighbors who are against polio drops is…
(among those saying some neighbors are against polio drops)

- All of their neighbors: 32%
- Most of their neighbors: 20%
- About half of their neighbors: 5%
- Not very many of their neighbors: 17%
- Only one or two of their neighbors: 20%

Context Note – among total respondents:
- All of their neighbors = 7%
- Most of their neighbors = 4%
- About half of their neighbors = 1%
- Not very many of their neighbors = 4%
- Only one or two of their neighbors = 4%

n=950
Momentum & Possible Province Pushback

- Self-reported coverage
- Motivation for taking OPV
- Intent to vaccinate in future
Caregiver Reports of Coverage During Last Campaign
Q41 and Q42

% caregivers saying...

- 95%
- 3%
- 1%
- 0%

- They are not aware of polio
- Vaccinators came and child did not receive drops (also unsure)
- Vaccinators did not come (also unsure)
- Child received drops

Context Note – 2016:
- Missed children was 5%

n=4800
### Caregiver Reasons for Child Receiving Polio Drops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% Major</th>
<th>% Minor</th>
<th>% Not a Reason</th>
<th>% Don't know/Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To protect child from polio</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to end polio for children in your village/neighborhood</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to end polio in Pakistan</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You or your family always give child polio drops</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many friends/neighbors give their children polio drops</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you don’t give child polio drops, the vaccinators will bother you</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Q43* % caregivers saying reason child received polio drops is a… (among those saying child received drops during last campaign)
Caregiver Reports of Coverage During Last Campaign
Q41 and Q42

% caregivers saying...

- They are not aware of polio
- Vaccinators came and child did not receive drops (also unsure)
- Vaccinators did not come (also unsure)
- Child received drops

**Context Note – 2016:**
*Missed children:*
- Balochistan = 5%
- FATA = 8%
- KP = 4%
- Sindh = 3%

---

**Caregiver Reports of Coverage During Last Campaign**

- **All high-risk UCs**
  - 95%
  - n=4800

- **Balochistan UCs**
  - 89%
  - n=1200

- **FATA UCs**
  - 95%
  - n=800

- **KP UCs**
  - 98%
  - n=1600

- **Sindh UCs**
  - 98%
  - n=1200
% caregivers saying, over the past year, child received polio drops...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every time</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not every time</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the times</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just a few of the times</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only once</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context Note – 2016:
- “Not every time” was 6%
Caregiver Acceptance and Refusal of Polio Drops Over Past Year

% caregivers saying, over the past year, child received polio drops not every time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n=4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n=800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n=1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n=1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes responses of “Most of the time”, “Just a few times”, “Only once”, “Never”, “Don’t know”
Caregiver Intent to Give Child Polio Drops

% caregivers saying they intend to give child polio drops...

Every time polio drops are offered
86%

Not every time polio drops are offered
14%

Most of the times
8%

Just a few of the times
3%

Only once
0%

Never
0%

Don’t know
2%

Have not heard of polio
0%

Context Note – 2016:
• “Every time” was 97%

n=4800
Caregiver Intent to Give Child Polio Drops

% caregivers saying they intend to give child polio drops not every time*

- All high-risk UCs: 14% (n=4800)
- Balochistan UCs: 27% (n=1200)
- FATA UCs: 12% (n=800)
- KP UCs: 6% (n=1600)
- Sindh UCs: 13% (n=1200)

*Includes responses of “Most of the time”, “Just a few times”, “Only once”, “Never”, “Don’t know”
Q34

% caregivers saying they intend to give child polio drops not every time*

All high-risk UCs: 14%

Balochistan UCs: 27%
- K Abdulah: 39%
- Quetta: 23%

FATA UCs: 12%
- FR Bannu: 38%
- Khyber: 6%

KP UCs: 6%

Sindh UCs: 13%
- K Baldia: 21%
- K Other: 5%

Balochistan: Pishin n=400, K Abdulah n=400; Quetta n=400;
FATA: Khyber n=400; FR Bannu n=400;
Sindh: K Baldia n=400; K Gadap n=400; K Other n=400

*Includes responses of “Most of the time”, “Just a few times”, “Only once”, “Never”, “Don’t know”
New Insights & Challenges

- Frequency of visits
- Pockets of inconsistency
  - Community support/norms
  - Individual support
Caregiver Perceptions of Frequency of Vaccinator Visits

Q54

% caregivers saying polio vaccinators came…

- Too many times: 48%
- About the right number of times: 41%
- Too few times: 7%

Context Note – 2016:
- “Too many” was 21%

n=4800
% caregivers saying polio vaccinators came too many times

- All high-risk UCs: 48% (n=4800)
- Balochistan UCs: 65% (n=1200)
- FATA UCs: 35% (n=800)
- KP UCs: 44% (n=1600)
- Sindh UCs: 41% (n=1200)
Caregiver Perceptions of Frequency of Vaccinator Visits

% caregivers saying polio vaccinators came too many times

All high-risk UCs

- Balochistan UCs
  - 48% (n=1200)
  - K Abdulah 52%
  - Quetta 69%
  - FR Bannu 75%
  - Khyber 26%

- FATA UCs
  - 35% (n=800)
  - Peshawar and Lakki M 48-54%
  - Other 7-15%

- KP UCs
  - 44% (n=1600)
  - K Baldia and Gadap 51-44%
  - Other 28%

- Sindh UCs
  - 41% (n=1200)
  - K Baldia n=400; K Gadap n=400; K Other n=400

Balochistan: Pishin n=400; K Abdulah n=400; Quetta n=400; FATA: Khyber n=400; FR Bannu n=400; KP: Tank n=400; Bannu n=400; Lakki Marwat n=400; Peshawar n=400
Sindh: K Baldia n=400; K Gadap n=400; K Other n=400
Caregiver Reports of Neighbors’ Opposition to Polio Drops

Q63

% caregivers saying any neighbors are against polio drops

Yes, some neighbors are against polio drops

21%

No, none are against polio drops

73%

Don’t know

4%

Context Note – 2016:
• “Some neighbors against” was 31%

n=4800
Caregiver Reports of Neighbors’ Opposition to Polio Drops

% *caregivers saying* some neighbors are against polio drops

- **All high-risk UCs**: 21%
- **Balochistan UCs**: 26%
- **FATA UCs**: 22%
- **KP UCs**: 18%
- **Sindh UCs**: 17%

n=4800
n=1200
n=800
n=1600
n=1200
Caregiver Views of Giving Polio Drops to Children in Neighborhood

% caregivers saying giving polio drops to children in neighborhood is a…

- **Very good idea**: 76%
- **Somewhat good idea**: 21%
- **Somewhat bad idea**: 1%
- **Very bad idea**: 0%

**Context Note – 2016:**
- “Very good idea” was 71%

n=4800
Caregiver Views of Giving Polio Drops to Children in Neighborhood

% caregivers saying giving polio drops to children in neighborhood is a very good idea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All high-risk UCs</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan UCs</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA UCs</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP UCs</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh UCs</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context Note - 2016:
- Balochistan UCs: 64%
- FATA UCs: 78%
- KP UCs: 73%
- Sindh UCs: 68%

Total n=4800; Balochistan UCs n=1200; FATA UCs=800; KP UCs =1600; Sindh UCs=1200
Initial Conclusions

Possible positive shifts
- Vaccinator views: overall improvements continue & perceived knowledge increases
  - Not necessarily attributable to specific Programme features
- Slightly higher perceptions of being well-embedded in local organizations
- Rumor circulation decreased – particularly in Balochistan
- Perceived community support up & perceived community opposition down

Momentum & possible province pushback
- Self-reported coverage is high – motivated by pull of protection/eradication and push of vaccinators
- Future intent is down a bit – Balochistan may be pushing back or being ‘realistic’

New Insights & challenges
- Perception of excessive visits is up; may not yet have an impact everywhere but there are early warning signs in Balochistan
- Pockets of inconsistency
  - Pockets of inconsistent support/norms
  - Geographic variation in key metrics
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